

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

JOSHUA CORNELL SKINNER,

ID # 2137079

Petitioner,

v.

DIRECTOR, Texas Department of
Criminal Justice, Correctional
Institutions Division,

Respondent.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

No. 3:21-CV-1246-X-BH

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND
RECOMMENDATION OF THE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

The United States Magistrate Judge made findings, conclusions, and a recommendation in this case. [Doc. No. 41]. The Magistrate Judge concluded that Skinner’s Motion to Stay [Doc. No. 40] should be denied “[b]ecause [Skinner] has not shown that he is entitled to a stay and abeyance under the standard set forth in *Rhines*.”¹ Skinner filed objections. [Doc. No. 42]. First, he claims that the “*Rhines* standard does not apply.”² But Skinner himself applies the *Rhines* standard, so he doesn’t adequately explain that objection. Second, Skinner styles his claim as a “dead-bang winner.”³ But Skinner merely regurgitates the same

¹ Doc. No. 41 at 4.


² Doc. No. 42 at 1 (emphasis added).

³ *Id.* at 3.

argument the Magistrate Judge rejected, and Skinner does not quibble with the Magistrate Judge's reasoning.

The District Court reviewed *de novo* those portions of the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation to which objection was made, and reviewed the remaining proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation for plain error. Finding none, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge. The Court **DENIES** Skinner's Motion to Stay.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 5th day of October 2022.



BRANTLEY STARR
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE